

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview between the undersigned and the Examiner on March 11, 2005. During the interview, the undersigned presented arguments as to why the prior art did not anticipate applicants' independent claims. Among other things, the undersigned explained that the prior art does not make any power supply adjustments.

At the conclusion of the March 11, 2005 interview, the Examiner indicated that he was planning to allow all pending claims in the application. The Examiner also requested that applicants present their arguments in written form to provide the Examiner with an opportunity to review the arguments one last time prior to allowance. Applicants are therefore filing this written Reply. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns about the Reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

In the February 22, 2005 Final Office Action, claims 2-10 and claims 12-20 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The sole independent

claims in the case -- claims 1 and 11 -- were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Soneda United States patent No. 4,858,195.

As the undersigned explained during the March 11, 2005 interview, the invention of claims 1 and 11 involves making power supply voltage adjustments to compensate for changes in MOS transistor thresholds. The Soneda patent, in contrast, discloses a sense amplifier that is tolerant to changes in MOS transistor thresholds. Because the Soneda sense amplifier is tolerant to threshold changes in its own right, Soneda has no need to make any power supply voltage adjustments.

Claims 1 and 11 are directed to approaches in which threshold voltage changes are measured and power supply adjustments are made to compensate accordingly. Soneda makes no mention of any power supply adjustments, let alone adjustments based on measured threshold voltages changes. Claims 1 and 11 are therefore not anticipated by Soneda.

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-10 and 12-20 are allowable because they depend from claims 1 and 11. This application is

therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this patent application and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 3/18/05

G. Victor Treyz

Reg. No. 36,294

Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 45851